* * * * * * * * * * * *

ED 011 575 UD 006 763
A SPECIAL ENRICHMENT PROGRAM GEARED TO EXCELLENCE FOR SCHOOLS IN TRANSITIONAL AREAS.
BY- HELLER, VIRGINIA
CENTER FOR URBAN EDUCATION, NEW YORK, N.Y.
PUB DATE 24 MAY 66
EDRS PRICE MF-$0.25 HC-$2.68 67P.

DESCRIPTORS- *SPECIAL SERVICES, ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS, JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOLS, *PROGRAM EVALUATION, ETHNIC DISTRIBUTION, RACIAL DISTRIBUTION, CLASS SIZE, SCHOOL PERSONNEL, QUESTIONNAIRES, RATING SCALES, ACHIEVEMENT TESTS, ATTENDANCE, *ENRICHMENT PROGRAMS, READING IMPROVEMENT, *TRANSITIONAL SCHOOLS, SPECIALISTS, GUIDANCE SERVICES, COUNSELING SERVICES, LIBRARY SERVICES, ESEA TITLE I PROGRAMS, NEW YORK CITY

A PROGRAM WHICH PROVIDED SUPERIOR EDUCATIONAL SERVICES TO ELEMENTARY AND JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOLS WAS EVALUATED. THE SPECIAL SERVICES WERE PROVIDED SO THAT THE WHITE MIDDLE CLASS EXODUS FROM THESE SCHOOLS, IN WHICH EDUCATIONAL ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS MAY HAVE FALLEN, WOULD BE CURTAILED. AS PART OF THE PROGRAM, ADDITIONAL PROFESSIONAL PERSONNEL WERE ALLOTTED TO 116 SELECTED SCHOOLS TO REDUCE CLASS SIZE, OFFER CORRECTIVE READING PROGRAMS, PROVIDE TEACHING BY SUBJECT SPECIALISTS, SET UP GUIDANCE CLASSES AND INCREASE COUNSELING SERVICES, EXPAND THE LIBRARIES, AND FACILITATE SPECIAL CLASSES AND CLUBS. THE PROGRAM EVALUATION WAS BASED ON MATERIAL PROVIDED BY THE BOARD OF EDUCATION--PRINCIPALS' QUESTIONNAIRES, SCALES FOR TEACHERS' RATING OF PUPILS, AND SCHOOL DATA ON ETHNIC COMPOSITION, READING AND ARITHMETIC ACHIEVEMENT, CLASS SIZE, AND ATTENDANCE. MOST OF THE PRINCIPALS AND TEACHERS FELT POSITIVELY ABOUT THE PROGRAM'S EFFECTIVENESS (THE IMPROVED READING PERFORMANCE, DEVELOPMENT OF A MUSIC PROGRAM, SMALLER CLASSES, AND MORE PREPARATION TIME FOR TEACHERS), ALTHOUGH THE AUTHOR FELT THAT INTERIM DATA DID NOT APPEAR TO JUSTIFY SUCH OPTIMISM. LACKING 1966 ETHNIC CENSUS FIGURES, THE AUTHOR WAS UNABLE TO EVALUATE THE SUCCESS OF THE PRIMARY GOAL--TO STEM THE WHITE MIDDLE-CLASS EXODUS. IN ADDITION, THE INSTRUMENTS USED IN THE STUDY WERE NOT SUFFICIENTLY INCLUSIVE AND THE TEST DATA LACKED ADEQUATE CONTROL FEATURES. (NH)

ED011535

CENTER FOR URBAN EDUCATION
33 West 42 Street, New York

Educational Practices Division
Nathan Brown, Associate Director

Evaluation of New York City School District educational projects funded under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (PL 89-10) - performed under contract with the Board of Education of the City of New York, 1965-66 School Year.

Joseph Krevisky
Research Coordinator, Title I Projects

A SPECIAL ENRICHMENT PROGRAM GEARED TO EXCELLENCE FOR SCHOOLS IN TRANSITIONAL AREAS*

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

* By agreement with the Board of Education, this evaluation was limited to an analysis of data from questionnaires administered by the Board of Education with a few supplementary interviews and observations by the evaluation team. No special instruments were created by the evaluation team.

VD 002 703

Mrs. Barbara Heller, Research Director
Lecturer, Division of Teacher Education, Office of Research and Evaluation, City University of New York

August 31, 1966

Introduction

Between 1950 and 1960 New York City's total white population decreased by 12.9 per cent while the Negro and Puerto Rican population increased 72.5 per cent. Accordingly, during these years there was considerable change in the ethnic composition of pupils enrolled in the city's public schools.

The Board of Education recently made available certain findings of the latest, 1965 school census. According to the figures reported in The New York Times;[1] the number of Negro and Puerto Rican children enrolled in the public schools rose by 36,500. At the same time, the exodus of non-Negro and non-Puerto Rican children amounted to 25,000. While these fluctuations did not greatly affect the total size of pupil registration in New York City, they did result in shifts in the distribution of the school population within the city.

It has been noted that schools in transitional neighborhoods characterized by changing residential patterns, changing ethnic composition and increasing numbers of low-income families may fall below certain educational standards of achievement and eventually require a great amount of special support in the form of additional personnel, funds and services. These special service schools are costly to maintain. The "transitional school" program represents one attempt to maintain the current status of the integrated schools in borderline neighborhoods that exist in New York City; the major objective of the program, "A Special Enrichment Program Geared to Excellence for Schools in Transitional Areas" is to "stem the tide of emigration of white middle class families by providing schools with such superior services that one would be reluctant to move."[2]

[1] Buder, L. Racial patterns shift in schools, The New York Times, Tuesday, June 7, 1966, p. 1.

[2] Project description prepared by the New York City Board of Education for "A Special Enrichment Program Geared to Excellence for Schools in Transitional Areas."

General Description of the Program

Under the provisions of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), Title I, a total of 116 selected public elementary and junior high schools were granted positions, to be paid by ESEA funds, for additional personnel for the school year 1965-66. These personnel were to provide an enriched program of educational experiences. Specifically, the goals of the program are stated as follows:[3]

"1. To increase proficiency in reading and arithmetic by providing special remedial teachers.

2. To increase general achievement by providing tutorial services both during and after the regular school day.

3. To increase interest in and motivation for school by providing a variety of special classes and clubs both during and after school.

4. To increase the general adjustment and mental hygiene by providing increased guidance services.

5. To increase motivation and appreciation for reading by offering improved library facilities.

6. To increase community pride in the schools by providing for active participation by parents in the school program."

In summary, the basic program during 1965-66 consisted of the allocation of certain types of professional positions to selected schools with the suggestion that these personnel be used to reduce class size, to initiate or expand corrective reading programs, to provide instruction by subject matter specialists, to set up special guidance classes and to increase counseling services, to expand libraries and to facilitate special classes and clubs both during and after school.

Description of the Evaluation

All information for this interim evaluation of the transitional school program was made available to the Center for Urban Education by the New York City Board of Education.

[3]Ibid

The actual preparation of questionnaires and the collection of data were supervised by Dr. Herbert N. Hoffman of the Bureau of Educational Research. Special appreciation is due to Dr. Joseph Justman, Mr. Joseph Krevisky and Mr. George Weinberg of the Center for Urban Education for their suggestions and support. Miss Linda Bancke, Mrs. Nancy Cardozo and the entire staff of the Center greatly facilitated the analysis of data and the preparation of this report.

This evaluation has two primary purposes: (1) to describe in number and kind the additional ESEA positions assigned to the schools and to ascertain, if possible, the influence of these personnel on school programs, services and activities, and (2) to determine the effects of these personnel, if any, on the academic performance, work habits, attitudes and motivations of the pupils. Whenever feasible, data were collected for the total of 116 schools, 79 elementary and 37 junior high schools. A sample, consisting of 25 elementary and 10 junior high schools, was selected at random to provide a smaller group of schools in those instances where there was not ample time to collect data for the total population of schools.

The following data were collected:

1. Principals' Questionnaires. In May 1966 a questionnaire was sent to the 116 transitional schools. A copy of this questionnaire can be found in Appendix A. In addition to enumerating the positions they were able to fill, these principals were asked to evaluate changes in school programs, pupil assignment and behavior, parental attitude, teacher morale, etc., resulting from the assignment of ESEA funded positions. The results of this questionnaire provided the basis for the first part of the analysis.

2. Scale for Teacher Rating of Pupils. Upon receipt of the Principals' questionnaire, rating scales were sent to both ESEA and non-ESEA personnel in the sample schools. A copy of the "Scale for Teacher Rating of Pupils" is appended (see appendix B.) Teachers were asked to rate pupil attitudes, habits and adjustments at the beginning and end of the school year.

3. Ethnic Data. The number and percentage of Negro, Puerto Rican and other pupils on register as of October 31 of 1963, 1964 and 1965 were collected for the total of 116 schools. Since comparable ethnic data is not yet available for 1966, it is not possible to determine the effects of the transitional school program on its primary objective, "stemming the tide of white emigration." Instead, the ethnic data are included to describe the current integrated status of the schools selected to participate in the program.

4. Reading Achievement Data. Mean grade equivalent scores based on the results of the City-Wide Metropolitan Reading Achievement Tests administered in April 1965, October 1965 and May 1966 were obtained for the 25 sample elementary schools. Test results were available for grades 2-6. The transitional school program began in September 1965; the October 1965 reading scores reflect the performance of the pupils early in the program. Year end scores, based on the results of the achievement test administered at the elementary school level in May 1966 will be used to determine rate of growth of pupils in the program and will also be compared with the achievement level of pupils in the same schools in April 1965, the year before the program was initiated.

At the junior high school level. mean grade equivalent scores were obtained for grades 7-9 in the ten sample schools. Results of the reading achievement tests administered in January 1965, October 1965 and May 1966 are available for comparison.

5. Arithmetic Achievement Data. The Iowa Basic Skills Arithmetic Test was administered to grades 4 and 6 only. Mean grade equivalent scores for the March 1965 and February 1966 administration are available for fourth graders in the 25 sample elementary schools. Sixth grade scores were also collected for the pupils in the sample schools; these arithmetic scores are based on achievement tests administered in February 1965 and February 1966. No arithmetic achievement test data is systematically collected at the junior high school level.

6. Class size Data. One of the primary procedures emphasized in the transitional school program is the reduction of class size in order to facilitate enrichment of the school program. Average class size in grades 2-6 for the sample elementary schools, and grades 7-9 in the sample junior high schools, were obtained for the school years 1965-66 (the year the program was in effect) and 1964-65 (the year prior to the start of the program). Average class size was obtained for each grade for each year at the beginning of that school year and at the end. Comparisons of changes in average class size will be presented.

7. Attendance Data. The per cent of attendance at the beginning and end of 1965-66 for each grade 2-6 in the sample elementary schools was computed. Comparable attendance scores were available for the school year prior to the program. Comparisons will be made of changes in per cent attendance. Similar attendance data are available for grades 7-9 of the sample junior high schools.

Description of The Schools in the Program

Distribution by Borough:

Seventy-nine elementary and 37 junior high schools received additional positions during 1965-66 as part of the transitional school program. The distribution of the schools by borough, both total and sample groups, is presented in Tables 1 and 2 respectively. A complete list of the individual schools as specified in the official contract is contained in Appendix C. Twenty-three elementary schools (29 per cent) and 16 junior high schools (43 per cent of the total number of junior high schools) are special service schools in addition to being transitional schools. It is anticipated that at least two more schools will be special service schools for the 1966-67 school year. (See Table I) There is no apparent explanation of why any special service school should be included in the program [5] since, theoretically, transitional schools receive fewer services than special service schools. Ideally, the special service designation would have provided an excellent indication of the success with

---

[5] Although the office of Elementary Schools of the Board of Education lists 56 transitional schools, the project description submitted to the Title I coordinator includes 23 additional special service schools, hinging the total number of elementary schools in the program to 79. It was decided to base the evaluation on the conditions stated in the project description.

Table I

Geographic Distribution of Transitional Elementary and Junior High Schools Receiving ESEA Funds.

	Elementary Schools (N=79)			Junior High Schools (N=37)		
	Total	Special Service	Non-Special Service	Total	Special Service	Non-Special Service
Borough						
Manhattan	16	13	3	3	2	1
Bronx	19	3	16	10	2	8
Brooklyn	20	7	13	17	11	6
Queens	23	0	23	7	1	6
Richmond	1	0	1	0	0	0
Total	79	23(29%)	56(71%)	31	16(43%)	21(57%)

which the transitional school program maintained the current educational status of the schools.

The schools are not distributed equally by borough; Queens has the largest number of transitional elementary schools, followed by Brooklyn, the Bronx, and Manhattan. Richmond has one elementary school in the program. With the exception of Richmond whose total school population is 11.6 per cent non-white, there is a direct relationship between number of transitional schools by borough and non-white school population by borough. The total non-white population in Queens is 23.9 per cent, in Brooklyn 49.6 per cent, in the Bronx 60.6 per cent and in Manhattan 71.5 per cent.[6] It would seem that the schools were actually selected from areas where the ethnic composition is such that integration in the schools could be achieved.

Twenty-five elementary schools and 10 junior high schools representing respectively a 32 per cent and a 27 per cent sample were selected for analysis. The distribution of the sample schools by borough is similar to the distribution of the total group; the major difference is in the junior high school sample where 60 per cent of the schools are special service schools. (See Table II)

6 The New York Times, op. cit.

Table 2

Geographic Distribution of the Sample Elementary and Junior High Schools Receiving ESEA Funds under the Transitional School Program

	Elementary Schools (N =25)			Junior High Schools (N = 10)		
	Total	Special Service	Non-Special Service	Total	Special Service	Non-Special Service
Manhattan	2	2	0	3	2	1
Bronx	4	2	2	3	1	2
Brooklyn	8	2	6	4	3	1
Queens	11	0	11	0	0	0
Richmond	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	25[1]	6	19	10[2]	6	4

[1] This represents a 32 per cent sample of the total number of elementary schools
[2] These 10 schools equal 27 per cent of the total number of junior high schools

Ethnic Composition

Ethnic data were collected for the total group of schools; the number and percentage of Negroes, Puerto Ricans and others on the school register as of October 31, 1963, 1964 and 1965 are summarized in Tables 3 and 4, for the elementary and junior high schools respectively. The data is tabulated separately for the special service and non-special service schools as well as for the combined total; in addition, the ethnic distribution in the sample schools is also presented.

There has been a year-to-year increase in the total number of pupils on register in the 79 transitional elementary schools (see Table 3). From 1963 to 1964 the total population in these schools increased by 3.1 per cent; from 1964-65 there was a smaller, 1.6 per cent, increase. For the group of sample schools, there was an increase in total register of 2.1 per cent from 1963 to 1964 and a 0.1 per cent increase from 1964 to 1965. Only the special service schools showed a decrease in total population from 1963 to 1964.

Table III

Number and Percentage of Negro, Puerto Rican and Others in the Elementary Schools in the Transitional School Program, 1963, 1964, 1965.

Elementary Schools	Number and Percentage on Register						Per Cent Change	Per Cent Change
	Oct. 1963		Oct. 1964		Oct. 1965			
	N	%	N	%	N	%	1963-1964	1964-1965
Total Elementary Schools (N=79)	83454	100.0	86051	100.0	87474	100.0	+3.1	+1.6
Negro	26681	32.0	30584	35.4	33061	37.8	+10.1	+8.1
Puerto Rican	15232	18.2	16318	19.0	18767	21.4	+7.4	+15.0
Other	41541	49.8	39149	45.6	35646	40.8	-5.7	-8.9
Special Service Schools (N=23)	24276	100.0	24166	100.0	24910	100.0	-0.5	+3.1
Negro	7182	29.6	7251	30.0	7265	29.6	+1.0	+1.6
Puerto Rican	9883	40.7	10146	42.0	11074	44.4	+2.7	+9.1
Other	7211	29.7	6769	28.0	6471	26.0	-6.1	-4.4
Non-Special Service Schools (N=56)	59178	100.0	61885	100.0	62564	100.0	+4.6	+1.1
Negro	19499	32.9	23333	37.7	25696	41.1	+19.7	+10.1
Puerto Rican	5349	9.1	6172	10.0	7693	12.3	+15.4	+24.6
Other	34330	58.0	32380	52.3	29175	46.6	-5.7	-9.9
Sample Schools (N=25)	28138	100.0	28728	100.0	28760	100.0	+2.1	+0.1
Negro	10756	38.2	12218	42.5	12755	44.4	+13.6	+4.4
Puerto Rican	4758	16.9	5115	17.8	6221	21.6	+7.5	+21.6
Other	12624	44.9	11395	39.7	9784	34.0	-9.7	-14.1

The Negro population has tended to increase; for the total group, the most dramatic increase occured between 1963 and 1964. The Puerto Rican population in these schools has also increased from 18 per cent of the total population in 1963 to about 21 per cent in 1965. The "other" population decreased from approximately 50 per cent in 1963 to about 41 per cent in 1965 for the total group, and from about 45 per cent in 1963 to 34 per cent in 1965 for the 25 schools in the sample group. The greatest decrease in "others" was in the group of sample schools. It is interesting that the special service schools, predominantly Negro and Puerto Rican (approximately 70 per cent of the total population), tend to be most stable with respect to changes in ethnic composition.

Comparable data for the junior high schools is presented in Table 4 below. Unlike the situation at the elementary level, the total register in the junior high schools has decreased, 0.1 per cent from 1963 to 1964 and by 5.4 per cent from 1964 to 1965. The decrease is especially consistent in the group of special service junior high schools. For the sample schools, from 1963 to 1964, the increase in total register was 0.5 per cent; there was a decrease of 2.6 per cent from 1964 to 1965.

At the junior high school level, the Puerto Rican population has consistently increased, both in number and percentage. The largest change in ethnic composition has been in the percentage of Others on register. For the total group of schools, others accounted for 58 per cent of the population in 1963 and about 50 per cent of the population in 1965. In the group of sample schools, 51 per cent of the population in 1963 was other and in 1965 45 per cent. Only in the group of non-special service schools does the number of others constitute a majority, accounting for 68 per cent of the total population in 1963 and 62 per cent of the total population in 1965. (see table 4).

Table IV

Number and Percentage of Negro, Puerto Rican and Others in the Junior High School in the Transitional School Program, 1963, 1964, 1965.

Junior High Schools	Number and Percentage on Register						Per Cent Change	Per Cent Change
	Oct. 1963		Oct. 1964		Oct. 1965			
	N	%	N	%	N	%	1963-64	1964-65
Total Junior High Schools (N=37)	56714	100.0	56645	100.0	53563	100.0	-0.1	-5.4
Negro	13787	24.3	15029	26.5	14803	27.6	+9.3	-1.4
Puerto Rican	9849	17.4	11070	19.6	11723	21.9	+12.3	+5.9
Other	33078	58.3	30546	53.9	27037	50.5	-7.7	-11.1
Special Service Schools (N=16)	23893	100.0	23387	100.0	22305	100.0	-2.1	-4.6
Negro	6053	25.3	6144	26.3	6442	28.9	+1.5	+4.9
Puerto Rican	7249	30.4	8077	34.5	8254	37.0	+11.4	+2.2
Other	10591	44.3	9166	39.2	7609	34.1	-13.5	-17.0
Non-Special Service Schools (N=21)	32821	100.0	33258	100.0	31258	100.0	+1.3	-6.0
Negro	7734	23.6	8885	26.7	8361	26.7	+14.9	-5.9
Puerto Rican	2600	7.9	2993	9.0	3469	11.1	+15.1	+15.9
Other	22487	68.5	21380	64.3	19428	62.2	-4.9	-9.1
Sample Schools (N=10)	14358	100.0	14427	100.0	14045	100.0	+0.5	-2.6
Negro	2516	17.5	2529	17.5	2460	17.5	+0.5	-2.7
Puerto Rican	4491	31.3	4910	34.0	5318	37.9	+9.3	+8.3
Other	7351	51.2	6988	48.5	6267	44.6	-4.9	-10.3

By 1965 elementary schools in the Transitional program are 38 per cent Negro, 21 per cent Puerto Rican and about 41 per cent others. During the two years prior to the start of the program there had been an increase in both the Negro and Puerto Rican populations and a decrease in the percentage of others on register. At the junior high school level, about 50 per cent of the population was "other" at the beginning of the program year. Although the total junior high school register has decreased during the past two years, there has been a consistent increase in the number and percentage of Puerto Ricans.

The primary effects of the transitional school program, to maintain the integrated status of these schools, can not be estimated until the results of the October 1966 census are available. However, it is unlikely that the current project, no matter how successful during its first year of operation, will have immediate and observable effects on the housing patterns and hence on the ethnic composition of the neighborhoods and of the schools.

Analysis of ESEA Positions Assigned, Received and Filled in The Elementary and Junior High Schools

Each of the 116 transitional schools were notified, shortly prior to the start of the school year, of the number and kinds of positions available to each of them. Each principal was primarily responsible for filling these positions, either from the ranks of his own school or from outside. In several cases the schools did not receive the final authorization to fill all the positions assigned to them, and several schools were unable to fill the positions because of the shortage of qualified and appropriately licensed personnel. An analysis was made of the number of each kind of position assigned, received and filled. This analysis is based on principals' responses to the first section of a three-page questionnaire (see appendix A.)

After a follow-up request, questionnaires were returned by all 37 junior high school principals and by 78 of the 79 elementary schools principals; one

special service elementary school principal in Manhattan (non-sample) did not respond. The results for the elementary schools in this section and in the sections following (effects on school programs, services and activities) are based on 78 returns.

Elementary Schools

Table 5 summarizes by number and type, the elementary schools positions assigned, received and filled.

The total number of positions assigned was 439.[7] Of these 439 positions, 96.6 per cent or 421.4 positions received final authorization; openings for 393.4 or 89.6 per cent of the assigned positions were eventually filled, although several were not filled until February or March of the 1965-66 school year. In the sample elementary schools about 31 per cent of the ESEA personnel were employed by the transitional school as of January 1966.

While one school was assigned as many as 13 additional positions, on the average of the 78 elementary schools were assigned an additional 5.63 positions. They were able to fill, on the average, 5.04 positions.

Sixty-five of the 78 schools received authorization to fill all positions; of these, only 50 were able to fill all openings. In general, each school was allotted somewhat more than one person to be used to reduce class size, one corrective reading teacher, and 19 teachers assigned for other remedial instruction.

Based on the percentage positions filled, the elementary schools tended most frequently to fill the positions of Assistant-to-Principal, Non-English Coordinator (N-1), Auxiliary Teacher, School Secretary, Remedial Personnel including CRT, Music, and Classroom Teachers. Schools were less likely, in general, to fill the positions of Guidance Counselor, Science Teacher, Health Education and Citizenship Class Teachers. (See table 5).

[7]There was a total of 442 positions allocated. Three positions, one corrective Reading Teacher (CRT), one Music teacher and one remedial instruction teacher were assigned to the elementary school that did not respond to the questionnaire.

Table 5

Total and Average Number of Elementary School ESEA Positions Assigned, Received and Filled under the Transitional School Program (N=78)

Position	ESEA Positions				
	Number Assigned		Total Number Received	Total Number Filled	Per Cent Filled (of Assigned)
	Total N	Average N			
School Secretary	50	.64	49	49	98.0%
Assistant to Principal	7	.09	7	7	100.0
Guidance Counselor	30	.38	24.4	23.4	78.0
Non-English Coordinator	1	.01	1	1	100.0
Citizenship Class	15	.19	14	12	80.0
Library	10	.13	9	9	90.0
Auxiliary Teacher	4	.05	4	4	100.0
Reduce Class Size	93	1.18	85	85	91.4
Corrective Reading *	78	1.00	78	73	92.3
Health Education	36	.46	34	29	80.6
Art	29	.37	29	24.4	84.1
Music	38	.49	40	35	92.1
Science	34	.44	32	26.6	78.2
Remedial Instruction *	15	.19	15	15	93.7
Total Number Positions*	439		421.4	393.4	89.6%
Average Number Positions	5.63		5.40	5.04	

*See Footnote 7.

Comparable data for the 25 elementary schools comprising the sample is presented in Table 6. Of the total of 162 assigned positions, 93.8 per cent were received and 139 or 85.8 per cent of them were filled, about 4 per cent less

than was filled in the total group. The easiest positions to fill, as reflected in the percentage filled, were Assistant-to-Principal, Auxiliary Teacher, Teachers for Remedial Instruction and Library and Art Teachers. The more difficult positions to fill included Guidance, Citizenship, Science and Music teachers. With the exception of the Music and Art teachers, the sample elementary schools are similar to the total group.

Table 6

Total and Average Number of ESEA Positions Assigned, Received and Filled in the Sample Elementary Schools (N=25)

	ESEA Positions				
	Number Assigned		Total Number Received	Total Number Filled	Per Cent Filled (of Assigned)
Position	Total N	Average N			
School Secretary	18	.72	17	17	94.4%
Assistant to Principal	3	.12	3	3	100.0
Guidance Counselor	10	.40	7	7	70.0
Non-English Coordinator	1	.04	1	1	100.0
Citizenship Class	7	.28	6	4	57.1
Library	4	.16	4	4	100.0
Auxiliary Teacher	2	.08	2	2	100.0
Reduce Class Size	39	1.56	35	35	89.7
Corrective Reading	25	1.00	25	23	94.0
Health Education	16	.64	16	13	81.2
Art	9	.36	10	9	100.0
Music	13	.54	12	10	76.9
Science	11	.44	10	7	63.6
Remedial Instruction	4	.16	4	4	100.0
Total Number Positions	162		152	139	85.8%
Average Number Positions	6.48		6.08	5.56	

Junior High Schools

Two hundred and eighty positions were assigned to the 37 junior high schools. The types of positions differ from those allocated to the elementary schools. On the average, each junior high school was assigned 1.65 teachers to reduce class size, 1.22 library teachers and 1.16 teachers to increase the number of teacher preparation periods. See Table 7.

Table 7

Total and Average Number of Junior High School ESEA Positions Assigned, Received and Filled Under the Transitional School Program (N=37)

	ESEA Positions				
	Number Assigned				
	Total Number	Average Number	Total Number Received	Total Number Filled	Percent Filled
School Secretary	40	1.08	39.6	38.2	95.5%
Guidance Counselor	18	.49	17	15	83.3
Laboratory Assistant	19	.51	19	18	94.7
Library	46	1.22	32	28	60.9
Corrective Reading Teacher	18	.49	18	17	94.4
Career Guidance	34	.92	29	27	79.4
Reduce Class Size	61	1.65	58	50	82.0
Preparation Period	44	1.16	40	38	86.4
Total Number Positions	280		252.6	231.2	82.6%
Average Number Positions	7.57		6.83	6.25	

of the total number of assigned positions, authorization was received to fill 252.6 (90.2 per cent) of them. Positions were filled in 82.6 per cent of the cases. Twenty-one of the 37 schools received all the positions allotted; only 15 of them were able to fill all positions.

Each junior high school was allotted, on the average, an additional 7.57 positions, somewhat more than the elementary schools, but tended to fill a smaller percentage of them. The positions filled most readily were those of secretary, laboratory assistant, and CRT; least filled positions included library teachers, career guidance teachers and extra teachers to reduce class size by forming additional classes.

Table 8

Total and Average Number of ESEA Positions Assigned, Received and Filled in the Sample Junior High Schools (N=10)

Positions	ESEA Positions: Number Assigned — Total N	Number Assigned — Average N	Total Number Received	Total Number Filled	Per Cent Filled
School Secretary	11.6	1.16	11.6	10.6	91.4%
Guidance Counselor	3	.30	3	3	100.0
Laboratory Assistant	7	.70	7	6	85.7
Library	11	1.10	10	9	81.8
Corrective Reading Teacher	5	.50	5	4	80.0
Career Guidance	10	1.00	5	5	50.0
Reduce Class Size	15	1.50	15	15	100.0
Preparation Period	17	1.70	17	15	87.6
Total Number Positions	79.6		73.6	67.6	84.8%
Average Number Positions	7.96		7.36	6.76	

Table 8 presents similar data for the ten sample junior high schools. This group of schools was assigned an average of 7.96 positions, received 92.5 per cent of the total assigned and filled about 85 per cent of the positions assigned. The sample schools had no difficulty in filling the position of guidance counselor and extra teachers, but could not readily fill the openings in library and career guidance.

In completing the questionnaire, principals were given the opportunity to comment on the program. As expected, most of the comments concerned the assignment of additional personnel. Although mixed, reactions in general tended to be favorable; anything extra is usually greeted by the schools as a bonus. Several principals expressed "thanks," and many asked for more positions next year. Many urged that the positions be made permanent, they are "an excellent boon." "Not only are these people needed, but more are needed." "We need all the people we can get." "They have been a godsend." "These positions should be continued, retained, expanded...."

However, some of the comments indicated some serious concern with the manner of assigning personnel. While most of the principals felt that these positions were "wonderful" they expressed resentments about (1) not having been notified of these positions early enough in the school year to be able to fill them, (2) not having been informed about these positions at all, (3) not having been notified that these were ESEA funded positions, (4) not having some of the positions assigned until late in the school year, and (5) not having had definite commitments about the final number of positions assigned. Several respondants expressed unfamiliarity with the transitional program and special concern about the permanency of the ESEA positions.

At the elementary level, the specialists were often drafted into classrooms because of the shortage of staff. Several of the elementary school principals commented that by creating these special positions we are creating a shortage of experienced classroom teachers while the most serious, already existing

shortage is with obtaining experienced classroom teachers. Two principals in particular felt it was futile to create these positions since it is difficult to fill them. One of the interesting problems brought about by these additional personnel is the increased strain created on physical working space.

In general, the junior high school principals were not as enthusiastic about these positions. Although they generally welcomed the personnel, they were more likely to be concerned with the basis on which assignments were made. Several strongly indicated that they should be the ones to decide which positions their schools needed and how these people should be used. Some stated it less directly by "volunteering to trade an assigned librarian," for example, "for a needed guidance counselor." Some principals also pointed to the shortage of trained personnel necessary to fill the ESEA positions.

Analysis of the Effects of the ESEA Positions on the Programs, Services and Activities in the Schools

This section is based on content analyses of principals' responses to questions 5, 6, 7 and 10 of the questionnaire, dealing with the effects of the assigned personnel on the educational programs, services and activities in the school.[8] In addition, the effects on teacher morale (question 11) and parental attitude (question 12) will be considered. Principals' responses to questions 8 and 9, pupil attitude and achievement will be treated separately at the end of this section.

Effects on Schools' Programs and Activities:

Seventy of the 78 elementary school principals indicated "yes," six checked "no" and two principals did not respond (NR) to question 5, "were there any programs, activities or curriculum adaptations instituted in your school that have been made possible as a direct result of one or more of the additional positions?" Only those principals checking "yes" commented on, or described, these programs and activities.

The descriptive comments, in response to question 6, "if yes, please describe the programs and activities," indicated several categories of programs. These included library and book programs (book fairs, clubs, etc.), art contests and art programs, music programs (orchestras, choruses, bands, dance, etc.), science programs, guidance activities, remedial reading activities, health education programs, field day activities and citizenship classes.[9]

---

[8] Returns are available for all 37 Junior High Schools and 78 of 79 Elementary Schools.

[9] The Citizenship Class Program, made possible through ESEA funds was initiated in September 1965 in the elementary schools. This program removes disruptive children from regular classes by providing special classes for them. Children may remain in citizenship classes until their behavior improves enough to return to regular classrooms.

Six of the elementary school principals checking "yes" did not describe any specific programs and two more did so in vague terms. The remaining 62 principals accounted for a total of 166 comments analyzed into content categories summarized in Table 9. it is obvious that the additional personnel were used almost twice as frequently to expand programs already in operation in the schools. Only the music and citizenship class programs were more often initiated during the transitional school program. The music and reading programs were most developed as a result of the assignment of additional personnel, although each school received on the average, one-half of a music teacher (see Table 5).

The program content categories at the junior high school level differ from the programs described by the elementary school principals primarily because there was a difference in the kinds of personnel made available. The categories and frequencies of comments are summarized in Table 10.

All junior high school principals answered question 5, 32 affirmatively and 5 negatively. Only 26 of the 32 principals checking "yes" described specific programs and activities. There were a total of 66 separate comments in each program content category. The additional ESEA personnel were used to augment and expand programs already in operation in the junior high schools. On the average, programs were expanded about five times more often than programs were initiated. Despite the difficulty the junior high school principals reported in filling openings for remedial and guidance personnel, these programs were most frequently developed as a direct result of the transitional school program.

Question 7, "Has there been any enrichment of current programs or activities as a result of the additional positions? Please comment.", was partly answered by the principals in response to the previous questions. The responses to question 7 seem to reflect enrichment of the current overall school activities

Table 9

Frequency of Programs and Activities Developed in the Elementary Schools as a Result of the Transitional School Program

	Total Elementary Group		
	Total	Old Program Expanded	New Program Initiated
N Principals Responding	76		
N Principals Describing Activities	62		
Total Comments	166	104	62
Frequency of Comments:			
Library/Book Programs	7	3	4
Art Programs	19	13	6
Music Programs	44	15	29
Science Programs	19	16	3
Guidance Programs	13	11	2
Reading Programs	40	30	10
Citizenship Classes	6	2	4
Health-Athletic Programs	15	11	4
Field Day Programs	3	3	0

Table 10

Frequency of Programs and Activities Developed in the Junior High Schools as a Result of the Transitional School Program

	Total Junior High School Group		
	Total	Old Program Expanded	New Program Initiated
N Principals Responding	37		
"Yes"	32		
"No"	5		
N Principals Describing	26		
Total Comments	66	54	11
Frequency of Comments:			
Guidance/Orientation Programs	15	11	4
Library/Book Programs	11	10	1
Science Program	10	8	2
Remedial Reading Programs	15	15	0
Remedial Math Programs	2	2	0
Social Science Programs	1	2	1
Miscellaneous*	3	6	3

*Includes advanced classes, SP classes and art and speech classes.

through the specific programs and procedures tabulated in Table 11.

Table 11 summarizes for the elementary and junior high school principals, the frequencies with which the general school program was enriched.

Table 11

Frequency of Enrichment of Current School Activities as a Result of the Transitional Program in the Elementary and Junior High Schools

	Frequencies	
	Elementary Schools	Junior High Schools
Total Principals Responding	74	36
Total "yes"	70	33
Total "no"	4	3
N Principals Describing	70	23
General School Program Enriched through:		
Library and Reading	27	18
Art	18	--
Science	15	18
Math	--	3
Citizenship Class	1	--
Music	29	--
Guidance	4	5
Health Education	17	--
Remedial Instruction	2	--
English and Speech	--	4
Foreign Language	--	1
Social Studies	--	3
Smaller Classes	3	8
More teacher preparation time	--	3
Special Miscellaneous Events	15	3
TOTAL	131	66

The 131 comments are based on the responses of 70 elementary school principals who checked "yes," there had been enrichment of current programs. There were two principals who did not respond to the question. The elementary school principals were of the opinion that as a result of efforts in music, reading, art, health education and science, the overall program in the elementary schools was improved.

Twenty-three of the junior high school principals who indicated enrichment, described the activities through which the general school program benefited: Reading and science was most frequently mentioned. There were 8 comments concerning improvement of the overall program as a result of smaller class size.

The effects of the transitional school program on guidance and guidance-related activities in the schools may be gauged from the principals' responses to question 10, "Has there been an increase in the identification of pupils having problems as a result of the additional positions?[10] Please comment." Seventy-six elementary school principals answered; there were 66 "yes" and 10 "no" responses. Two-thirds of those responding positively tended merely to restate the question; there were 32 analyzable comments. Of these, 15 concerned increased identification of emotionally maladjusted children, 15 noted increased identification of children with reading disturbances and two mentioned identifying children with physical problems. Principals concurred that the increased identification of problem children was due in large part to the smaller classes.

Thirty junior high schools indicated increased identification of children having problems; five principals noted no change. Most principals were vague, but there were five comments concerning identification of reading and speech retardates and two comments about science and mathematics retardates.

---

[10]Ed. note: The non-sequitor is, I hope, unintentional.

Effects on Teacher Morale:

Most elementary school principals answered "yes" to question 11, "Have there been any changes in teacher morale as a result of these positions? Please comment." Five principals did not feel there was any noticeable change, and three principals did not respond to this question. In general, the principals felt the change was a positive change, although they were not very specific. The improvement in teacher morale was attributed to (1) smaller class size, (2) assistance with problem children, and (3) more preparation time for teachers. Three principals noted negative changes in morale.

Although junior high school principals indicated some change in morale (34 "yes" responses, three "no" responses), they also tended to be vague. They attributed improved morale to a reduction in teacher load as a result of extra services and reduced class size. Two principals felt that morale suffered as a result of the assignment of additional personnel.

Effects on Parental Attitude:

In response to question 12, "Have there been any changes in parental attitude as a result of these positions?" 72 elementary school principals indicated a positive, if somewhat vague, improvement in parental attitude. Three principals did not respond; the remaining three did not acknowledge any change.

Twenty junior high school principals were of the opinion that there was a change in parental attitude, and ten said there was no change. (Seven principals did not respond to this question.) Eight of these ten principals indicated that it was too early and/or too unscientific to estimate change at this point.

Effects on Academic Performance:

Principals were asked (question 8) if, "it is possible for you to report any academic improvement as a result of the additional positions? Please comment."

The content analysis, summarized in Table 12, is based on the comments of the 59 elementary school principals who were of the opinion that there was academic improvement. Six principals did not answer question 8 and 13 were not able to

Table 12

Frequency with which Academic Improvement was Noted as a Result of the Transitional School Program

	Elementary Schools	Junior High Schools
N Principals Responding	72	32
"yes"	59	25
"no"	13	7
Total Comments	65	30
N Principals Describing Improvement in:	65	12
Over-all achievement	8	6
Art	2	-
Reading	49	13
Science	4	2
Music	2	-
Speech/English	-	3
Library & Research	-	2
Math	-	4

report any change. Most of those who felt there was no reportable change indicated that it was too early to determine.

It is important to note that the qualifying aspects of the responses tabulated in Table 12 are omitted from the analysis. Responses such as "the art teacher co-

ordinated art and science, and as a result, there was improvement in science" were scored as "Improvement in science." As determined by the frequencies, the area of greatest improvement was undoubtedly reading. There were 49 mentions of improved performance in reading; one principal anticipated growth of as much as 2.5 years. Since the transitional schools received and generally fitted, on the average, one corrective reading teacher and .2 of a remedial instruction teacher and since reading is stressed in the schools it is not surprising that improvement in this area was frequently mentioned. What is noteworthy is the infrequency with which music is mentioned, especially in the light of the expansion and development of the music programs.

The responses of the junior high school principals to the question of academic improvement are also presented in Table 12 above. Five principals did not answer this question, seven answered negatively and the remaining twenty-five felt there was a positive change in academic performance. Of these twenty-five, thirteen principals did not commit themselves to specifics. Inspection of the comments of 12 principals summarized in Table 12 indicates that improvement in reading was most often noted.

Effects on Pupil Attitude and Behavior:

Question 9 was concerned with changes in pupil attitude or behavior as a result of the additional positions, and 70 elementary school principals agreed that there was a change. All except one were of the opinion that the change was positive; the exception felt that pupil behavior worsened, and he attributed this to fragmented instruction. Four principals noted no change in either direction and the remaining four did not answer question 9. The content categories and frequency of comments are tabulated in Table 13.

Table 13

Frequency of Changes in Pupil Behavior and Interest as a Result of the Transitional School Program

	Frequency of Response	
	Elementary Schools	Junior High Schools
Improvement in general:		
Behavior	45	14
Increased interest in:		
Art	10	--
Science	8	3
Music	11	--
Health Education	8	--
Library & Reading	24	4
Remedial Instruction	--	5

The most frequently occuring comment was concerned with general, non-specific improvement in the attitude and behavior of pupils. Increased interest was noted in reading and books, music, art, science and health education.

The junior high school principals also frequently commented on general behavioral improvement. Some mention was made of improved attitudes toward science, library and remedial instruction. The results are summarized in Table 13. Twenty-six of the junior high school principals felt there was a change, six said there was no change and five principals did not answer this question.

Table 14

Average Beginning and End Year Ratings of Pupils in Elementary Schools by the Teachers in the Sample Schools (N=24)

Rating Scale Items	ESEA Personnel (N=96)			Non-ESEA Personnel (N=250)		
	Beginning Yr. Mean Score	End Yr. Mean Score	Mean Weighted Difference	Beginning Yr. Mean Score	End Yr. Mean Score	Mean Weighted Difference
Scholastic Attitudes						
Item 1	3.9	2.9	+1.02	3.4	2.6	+0.79
Item 2	3.8	2.9	+0.83	3.5	2.9	+0.63
Item 3	3.9	3.1	+0.95	3.6	2.8	+0.76
Social Attitudes						
Item 4	3.9	3.1	+0.79	3.7	2.9	+0.80
Item 5	3.7	2.9	+0.82	3.3	2.6	+0.66
Item 6	3.8	3.0	+0.77	3.4	2.8	+0.67
Item 7	3.4	2.9	+0.51	3.1	2.7	+0.44
Work Habits						
Item 8	3.9	3.0	+0.88	3.6	2.8	+0.80
Item 9	3.2	2.9	+0.28	3.0	2.7	+0.32
Item 10	3.8	3.0	+0.80	3.5	2.7	+0.80
Adjustment						
Item 11	3.7	3.0	+0.71	3.4	2.8	+0.59
Item 12	3.8	3.0	+0.82	3.5	2.7	+0.75
Achievement						
Item 13	4.0	3.2	+0.78	3.6	3.0	+0.60
Item 14	4.0	3.2	+0.83	3.5	2.8	+0.79

Note: For a list of the items see Appendix C.

Analysis of Changes in Pupil Attitudes, Work and Study Habits, Adjustment and Achievement as Determined by Teachers' Ratings

At the end of the first year of the program, a scale for teacher ratings of pupils was sent to all the ESEA funded personnel in the sample elementary and junior high schools. Rating scales were also distributed to two teachers selected by the principal on each grade level. A copy of the Scale for Teacher Rating of Pupils is contained in Appendix B.

The purpose of this scale was to evaluate pupils on a group basis as they were remembered at the beginning of the school year and as they are presently thought of. Ratings were to be made of 14 specific items categorized under five headings, Scholastic Attitudes, Social Attitudes, Work and Study Habits, Adjustment and Achievement. The following ratings were suggested: 1 = superior, 2 = above average, 3 = average, 4 = below average, 5 = poor.

Elementary School Sample

Returns were received from a total of 346 personnel in 24 of the 25 sample elementary schools. (Complete data were not received from one elementary school in Queens.) Of the 139 ESEA positions (see sample schools, Table 6), 96 teachers (69 percent) completed the rating scale. The non-ESEA personnel returned a total of 250 scales, about 71 percent of the scales distributed.[11]

The results of the ESEA and non-ESEA teachers' ratings of pupils in the sample elementary schools is summarized in Table 14. A beginning year and end year mean score, and a weighted mean difference score was computed for each of the 14 items in the scale (see Appendix C).

---

[11] Rating scales were distributed to 14 non-ESEA personnel, two on each grade level (K-6), in each of 25 schools, totalling 350 people.

Improvement was noted in each of the items by both groups of teachers. Without exception, the ESEA personnel rated beginning year pupil performance more poorly than did the non-ESEA personnel. However, the group of ESEA teachers in general, indicated greater pupil gain by the end of the program year; only in item 9, Attendance, was the weighted mean difference score larger for the non-ESEA group.[12]

The first three items, (1) positiveness of attitudes toward school and school work, (2) interest in voluntary, supplementary school activities and, (3) motivation for self-improvement, were believed to measure "Scholastic Attitudes." Both teacher groups, ESEA and non-ESEA, noted improvement in scholastic attitude, especially in pupil attentiveness (item 1). The ESEA personnel saw greater change than did the non-ESEA personnel, although their beginning year ratings were poorer.

Social attitudes, respect for rights of others, respect for teachers, respect for school rules and property and personnel appearance and grooming were measured by items 4, 5, 6 and 7 respectively. All ratings indicated positive change; the ESEA personnel found greater improvement than did the non-ESEA personnel.

The ratings of work and study habits, items 8, 9 and 10 (dependability regarding class, test and home preparation, school attendance and adherence to teacher instructions) reflect the same pattern noted above. Although both teacher groups indicated positive change, there was a difference in beginning year ratings between the ESEA and non-ESEA teachers, as well as an absolute difference between them.

---

[12]The weighted mean difference is not equivalent to the arithmetic difference between the average beginning and end year score.

Adjustment, in terms of peer relations and classroom behavior (items 11 and 12 respectively) also improves; the end year ratings indicated an average or better than average pupil adjustment level. Again, the ESEA group noted greater improvement than did the non-ESEA group.

Items 13 and 14, test performance and general class and scholastic performance are the Achievement items. Both ESEA and non-ESEA personnel indicated positive change in pupil achievement.

For both teacher groups, attendance patterns showed the least beginning-to-end-year change; there was comparatively little change in pupils' personal appearance and grooming (item 7) and in their relations with peers (item 11). There is a difference between groups in the areas of greatest improvement: The ESEA personnel indicated greatest improvement in pupil attentiveness (item 1), notivation (item 3), preparation for school (item 8) and interest in voluntary and supplementary school activities (item 2); the non-ESEA group of teachers felt that pupils' respect for the rights of others (item 4), school preparation (item 8), and adherence to teacher instructions (item 10), were most improved.

In summary, the ESEA personnel rated the pupils as below average, in general, at the beginning of the year and about average by the end of the school year; non-ESEA personnel remembered the pupils as somewhat below average at the beginning and somewhat better than average by the end of the school year. Over-all, these ratings are in accord with the opinions and evaluations of the elementary school principals previously discussed, indicating general satisfaction with the effects of transitional school program.

The fact that the group of ESEA personnel noted greater improvement than did the group of non-ESEA personnel may be attributed to the former's image of themselves as specialists and/or to the role of specialists in the elementary school. In either case, it is probable that the specialist meets smaller groups

of children at a time and deals with them in a more circumscribed problem area than does the common branches' teacher; thus, specialists may be more critical of pupils and at the same time, be better able to attend to small but important changes in performance and attitude. The non-ESEA personnel noted greatest improvement in those areas recognized as important to a classroom teacher.

Junior High School Sample

The same teacher rating scales were sent to the ten junior high sample schools; returns were received from nine of them. One junior high school in Brooklyn did not complete the scales. The analysis is based on 91 returns from nine schools. Thirty-seven ESEA personnel, about 55 percent of the total number,[13] and 54 (an estimated 90 percent) non-ESEA personnel in the junior high schools completed the scales.

Average beginning year and end year ratings were computed for each of the 14 items in the Teacher Rating Scale for Pupils separately for the groups of ESEA and non-ESEA personnel. Weighted mean difference scores were also obtained; these mean scores are summarized in Table 15.

One of the most striking aspects of the ratings, obvious in inspecting the scores in Table 15, is the small change from the beginning to the end of the school year, especially for the ESEA personnel. The ESEA teachers consistently noted less change than did the non-ESEA personnel. In general, both ESEA and non-ESEA personnel ranked the pupils in the sample junior high schools as better than average at the beginning of the program; these ratings were better than the comparable ratings of the elementary school personnel.

---

[13]There were a total of 676 filled ESEA positions in the sample junior high schools. See Table 8.

Table 15

Average Beginning and End Year Ratings of Pupils in Junior High Schools by the Teachers in the Sample Schools (N=10)

Rating Scale Items	ESEA Personnel (N=37)			Non-ESEA Personnel (N=54)		
	Beginning Yr. Mean Score	End Yr. Mean Score	Mean Weighted Difference	Beginning Yr. Mean Score	End Yr. Mean Score	Mean Weighted Difference
Scholastic Attitudes						
Item 1	2.9	2.8	+0.11	3.0	2.7	+0.33
Item 2	2.9	2.8	+0.07	3.1	2.7	+0.33
Item 3	3.2	2.9	+0.16	3.1	2.6	+0.50
Social Attitudes						
Item 4	3.0	2.9	+0.11	3.1	2.9	+0.26
Item 5	3.0	3.0	+0.09	3.1	2.7	+0.41
Item 6	2.9	2.9	0	3.1	3.0	+0.11
Item 7	2.7	2.8	-0.17	2.9	2.8	+0.56
Work Habits						
Item 8	3.3	3.1	+0.23	3.2	2.8	+0.35
Item 9	3.0	3.0	-0.03	2.9	2.9	-0.04
Item 10	3.1	2.8	+0.26	2.9	2.5	+0.38
Adjustment						
Item 11	2.7	2.8	-0.06	2.9	2.5	+0.43
Item 12	3.0	2.9	+0.06	3.0	2.7	+0.30
Achievement						
Item 13	3.2	2.9	-0.14	3.3	2.8	+0.56
Item 14	3.2	3.0	+0.20	3.2	2.7	+0.52

Note: For a list of the items see Appendix C.

The group of ESEA teachers indicated no change in behavior, or a negative change in behavior (the pupils were worse at the end of the year than they were remembered at the beginning) in items 7, 13, 11, 9, 6 and 5 -- personal appearance, test performance, peer relations, attendance, respect for rules and property and respect for teachers. The non-ESEA personnel noted positive pupil gain in all areas except attendance (item 9). As a group, the non-ESEA teachers noted some positive improvement in personal appearance (item 7), test performance (item 13), general scholastic performance (item 14) and in motivation for self-improvement (item 3).

In interpreting these data, it is important to keep in mind the attitude of the junior high school principals and the role of the ESEA specialists at grade levels where most teachers may be considered specialists. As noted, junior high school principals were less enthusiastic in general than elementary grade principals and this may be reflected in the teachers' attitudes toward the program. However, the ratings may indicate genuinely smaller gains in performance, consistent with repeated findings for pupils of junior high school age.

Analysis of Growth in Reading Achievement

As part of the city-wide testing program, pupils in the transitional schools were tested in reading achievement at the beginning of the year in October 1965, and again at the end of the school year in May 1966. In addition, reading scores are available for pupils in the same schools in April 1965. Comparisons will be made between their obtained weighted mean grade equivalent scores and the theoretical grade placement scores.[14] Grade equivalent scores are based on the

---

[14] Weighted mean grade equivalent scores are obtained by multiplying the number of pupils in each grade taking the test by the average score obtained in that grade and dividing by the total number of pupils in that grade.

assumption of equal growth during each of the ten months in a school year. In a group of normally achieving pupils, grade equivalent scores should equal grade placement level. Thus, in September of any school year the grade placement score of second graders is 2.0 (7.0 for grade 7). In October, one month later, pupils in grade 2 should achieve at a 2.1 level (7.1 for grade 7); in April, second graders placement level is 2.7, and so on.

Elementary Schools

Reading scores are available for grades 2-6 in the 25 sample elementary schools. These scores are based on the October 1965 and May 1966 administration of the Metropolitan Reading Achievement Test. The April 1965[15] scores were included to present some comparison with a similar group of pupils in the same grades in the same schools who were not in the program.

The number of pupils taking the tests in grades 2-6 in the sample schools, and the weighted mean grade equivalent scores are summarized in Table 16 below. At the start of the program, in October 1965, the pupils in grades 2-6 scored 1.9, 2.8, 3.5, 4.9 and 5.7 respectively. The theoretical grade placement scores in October are 2.1, 3.1, 4.1, 5.1 and 6.1. At the start of the program, second graders were retarded two school months in reading, third graders were retarded three school months, and the pupils in grades 4, 5 and 6 are, on the average, six, two and four months below their respective theoretical grade placement level.

By the end of the school year, pupils in grade 2 obtained a weighted mean score of 2.5; the weighted mean grade equivalent score was 3.7 for grade 3, 4.4 for grade 4, 5.5 for grade 5 and 6.5 for grade 6. The difference between grade placement level and obtained average score was three months, one month and four

---

[15]Grade 6 scores were obtained from a December 1964 administration of the Reading Test; at that time sixth grade placement was 6.3.

Table 16

Mean Grade Equivalent Scores and Number of Pupils Taking the Reading Achievement Test in the Sample Elementary Schools

	Metropolitan Reading Achievement Test Scores					
	April 1965		October 1965		May 1966	
Grades	N. Taking Test	Weighted Mean Score	N. Taking Test	Weighted Mean Score	N. Taking Test	Weighted Mean Score
2	3937	2.6	3525	1.9	3570	2.5
3	3822	3.5	3518	3.8	3859	3.7
4	3365	4.3	3490	3.5	3759	4.4
5	3448	5.5	3236	4.9	3218	5.5
6	3317	6.0	2417	5.7	2513	6.5

months for grades 2, 3 and 4. Grades 5 and 6 were both three school months retarded in reading.

In April 1965, pupils in the same sample schools were tested in reading. The amount of retardation was one school month, two months, four months, two months and seven school months for grades 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6 respectively. Comparing the April 1965 and May 1966 groups there was little difference in retardation; second graders in the program were 2 months more retarded, third graders gained one month over the prior group of second graders, and there was no difference in amount of retardation in grade 4. Only in grade 6 was there a large difference; the program pupils, although three school months retarded in reading, were less retarded than the sixth graders of the 1964-65 school year.

Junior High Schools

Table 17 summarizes the results in reading for grades 7-9 in the ten sample schools.

Table 17

Mean Grade Equivalent Scores and Number of Pupils Taking the Reading Achievement Test in the Sample Junior High Schools

Grades	Metropolitan Reading Achievement Test Scores					
	January 1965		October 1965		May 1966	
	N. Taking Test	Weighted Mean Reading Score	N. Taking Test	Weighted Mean Reading Score	N. Taking Test	Weighted Mean Reading Score
7	4908	6.6	4539	6.2	4075	6.8
8	4653	7.2	4159	6.8	4068	7.5
9	4484	8.3	4488	8.2	4305	8.6

The results are based on the October 1965 and May 1966 administration of the Metropolitan Achievement Tests. The previous year's scores, January 1965, are included for comparison.

In October 1965, the seventh, eighth and ninth graders taking the test scored 6.2, 6.8 and 8.2 respectively. In comparison with the grade placement level, all pupils were retarded in reading; grades 7 and 9 are both nine school months retarded and eighth graders are one year three months below grade placement level. By May 1966, the end of the first year of the program, the pupils in grade 7 scored a full year below grade level and the eighth graders, on the average, are still one year three months retarded in reading. By May 1966, pupils in grade 9 showed an increase in their rate of retardation.

During the middle of the previous year, grades 7, 8 and 9, tested in January were respectively 8 months, one year two months and one year one school month below grade placement level. There is little difference between the performance of pupils in the program and similar pupils in the same schools the year before.

Despite the enthusiasm of the principals for the additional personnel and for the reading programs initiated and expanded under the provisions of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, Title I, there was no marked change in the average reading performance of pupils in the sample schools. However, the data does not evaluate individual change and may not reflect the individual growth commented on by the principals.

Analysis of Arithmetic Achievement in the Elementary Schools

Each year, as part of the city-wide testing program, pupils in grades 4 and 6 are tested in arithmetic achievement. Results from the February 1965 and February 1966 administration of the Iowa Basic Skills Arithmetic Test were used to estimate the success of the transitional school program in "increasing proficiency in arithmetic."

In February 1966, fourth grade pupils in the program obtained a weighted mean grade equivalent score of 3.7; for sixth graders in the 25 sample elementary schools, the mean grade equivalent score was 5.5. In comparing the obtained scores with the theoretical grade placement level both grade groups were retarded in arithmetic; the fourth grade pupils were 8 months below grade placement level and the sixth graders were one year below grade level in arithmetic in February 1966.

In February 1965, the year before the program, fourth and sixth grade pupils in the same schools obtained a weighted mean grade equivalent arithmetic score of 4.1 and 6.1 respectively. See Table 18. At this time, fourth graders were only

Table 18

Mean Grade Equivalent Scores and Number of Pupils in Grades 4 and 6 Taking the Arithmetic Achievement Test

	February 1965*		February 1966	
	N	Weighted Mean Arithmetic Score	N	Weighted Mean Arithmetic Score
Grade 4	3213	4.1	3583	3.7
Grade 6	3299	6.1	2699	5.5

*Grade 4 took the Iowa Basic Skills Test in Arithmetic in March of 1965.

five school months below normal grade level and sixth graders were retarded four months in arithmetic. The February 1965 and 1966 arithmetic achievement test scores are summarized in Table 20.

In order to test the significance of the difference between means of fourth and sixth grade pupils in 1964-65 and 1965-66, tests were done. At the fourth grade, the difference of four months between the 1964-65 and 1965-66 groups was significant. The difference of six school months in grade equivalent scores between the six graders in 1964-65 and 1965-66 was also significant at the .01 level in favor of the group of pupils in the sample schools during the year before the program was in effect.

It would seem apparent that the transitional school program did nothing to improve performance in arithmetic as measured by standardized achievement tests. In fact, pupils in the program were poorer in arithmetic than comparable pupils not in the program. However, it should be kept in mind that these results were affected by the continuing shift in pupil populations, so that later groups had a greater number of disadvantaged children. Although each sample elementary

school did receive, on the average, an additional .16 teachers of remedial instruction, it is impossible to determine how much, if any, of this teacher time was devoted to remedial instruction in arithmetic. According to the results of the principals' questionnaire, there were no arithmetic programs initiated as a result of the additional ESEA positions, there was no enrichment of current programs in arithmetic and there was no specific mention of improved achievement in arithmetic in the elementary schools. It is possible that in emphasizing other skills and programs, arithmetic was neglected during the first year of the transitional school program.

The Effects of the Assignment of ESEA Personnel on the Reduction of Class Size

In order to raise the degree of excellence in the transitional schools, additional classroom teachers were placed in these schools. Thirty-nine additional classroom teachers were assigned to the 25 sample elementary schools in order to "reduce class size to the lowest in the city." Thirty-five, about 90 percent of these positions, were filled. At the junior high school level, 100 percent of the 15 positions assigned to reduce class size were filled. Each elementary school in the sample finally averaged about 1.4 additional teachers to reduce class size; the the junior high school level there was, on the average, 1.5 additional teachers to reduce the size of classes in each of the ten schools.

The number of classes and the average size of classes in grades 2-6 and grades 7-9 were collected for the school years 1964-65 (the year prior to the program) and 1965-66 (the year of the program) for the sample schools. This data is tabulated eight times a year, during each of eight official attendance periods, by the Board of Education. It was decided to present beginning and end year data for the two years under consideration; attendance periods 2 and 6

were selected. Period two is from mid-October through approximately mid-November; period 6 is from mid-March through mid-April of the school year. At the time of data collection, period 6 was the most recent period for which complete data was available.

The number of classes and the average class size for the 25 elementary schools, grades 2-6, is presented in Table 19; comparable data on class size in the sample junior high schools is presented in Table 20.

Elementary Schools

During 1964-65, the year prior to the program, there was a total of 652 classes in grades 2 - 6 in the 25 elementary schools in the sample. There was no change in the number of classes in each grade from the beginning of the year, period 2, to the end of the school year, period 6, although there was a change in register at each grade level. There was a slight decrease in pupil population at grades 2 and 4, and a slight increase in register in grades 3, 5, and 6; there was a total loss from period 2 to 6 of approximately 200 pupils.

The average size of the second and fourth grade classes decreased with the decrease in register as can be seen in Table 19, the average size of classes in grades 3, 5, and 6 increased slightly during 1964-65.

Table 19

Average Class Size and Number of Classes in Grades 2-6 in the Sample Elementary Schools

	1964 - 65				1965 - 66			
	Period 2		Period 6		Period 2		Period 6	
Grades	No. of Classes	Average Size	No. of Classes	Average Size	No. of Classes	Average Size	No. of Classes	Average Size
2	146	30.8	146	30.3	144	30.6	144	29.9
3	137	30.6	137	30.9	139	30.2	139	29.6
4	128	30.3	128	28.4	136	30.6	136	29.8
5	125	30.2	125	30.5	130	29.6	130	28.7
6	116	29.7	116	29.8	101	29.6	101	28.8
Total 2-6	652	30.3	652	30.0	650	30.1	650	29.4
Total N Pupils		19767.9		19558.4		19597.4		19111.7

During the year in which the transitional school program was in effect, the total number of classes in grades 2 - 6 decreased from 652 to 650 classes. The

total register, both in periods 2 and 6 of 1965-66 was smaller than in the previous year, especially in grades 4 and 6. The average size of classes during period 6 of 1965-66 was 29.9, 29.6, 29.8, 28.7 and 28.8 for grades 2-6 respectively. When compared with the same attendance period of the previous year, the average differences in class size were -.4, -1.3, -1.8 and -1.0 for grades 2, 3, 5 and 6 respectively. Only in grade 4 was there an increase in average class size. The largest decrease in average class size was in grade 5, class size was reduced, in general, by almost 2 pupils.

Junior High Schools

Comparable data for the sample junior high schools is summarized in Table 20 below.

Table 20

Average Class Size and Number of Classes in Grades 7-9
in the Sample Junior High Schools

	1965 - 65				1965 - 66			
	Period 2		Period 6		Period 2		Period 6	
Grades	No. of Classes	Average Size	No. of Classes	Average Size	No. of Classes	Average Size	No. of Classes	Average Size
7	184	29.5	184	29.5	178	29.1	178	26.8
8	169	29.8	169	29.2	163	28.8	163	28.1
9	167	28.4	167	28.2	181	27.4	181	26.7
Total 7-9	520	29.2	520	29.0	522	28.4	522	27.2
Total N Pupils		15191.7		15061.5		14822.3		14188.6

During 1964-65 there was a total of 520 classes in grades 7-9 in the ten schools comprizing the sample junior high school group. There was an increase of two classes during 1965-66. The total junior high school register decreased. The registers in

grades 7 and 8 decreased from period 2 to 6 during 1964-65 and decreased further from period 2 to 6 during 1965-66. In grade 9 there was an increase in register of about 100 pupils.

Comparing period 6 with period 6, 1964-65 to 1965-66, there was a decrease in average class size of 2.7 for grade 7, 1.1 for grade 8 and 1.5 for grade 9. For the total junior high school, the decrease in average class size was 1.8 pupils.

Principals of the sample junior high schools reported less difficulty in obtaining additional teachers to reduce class size than did the sample group of elementary school principals. At the elementary level the total group of schools had less difficulty in filling these positions than did the sample group of schools. In addition, principals of the elementary schools reported the shortage of regular classroom teachers and indicated that the specialists were often drafted into the classroom as a result of the shortage. These findings are reflected in the data on class size.

Not only are classes at the elementary grades larger than classes at the junior high school level, but the reduction in average size of classes is smaller. It would appear that the problem of large class size is most severe in the elementary schools and many more teachers are needed to effect any change in class size.

Analysis of the Effects of the Assignment of ESEA Personnel on School Attendance

While the transitional school program does not include in its objectives a specific statement relating to improvement in school attendance, it can be anticipated that any education program successful in improving achievement and stimulating interest in and motivation for school will have positive implications for pupil attendance.

An analysis was made of the percentage of pupils in grades 2 through 6 and grades 7 through 9 who attended school. For each of the sample elementary and junior high schools, attendance figures were collected for period two and period six for 1964-65 and 1965-66. The number of pupils attending during any attendance period is divided by the number of pupils on register in that given period. The attendance rates for the elementary and junior high schools are presented below. Elemtary Schools. Table 21 summarizes the beginning and end year attendance rates, 1964-65 and 1965-66, for the 25 sample elementary schools.

The Average Percentage of Elementary Grade Pupils Attending School During 1964-65 and 1965-66 in the Sample Schools.

Table 2

Average Per Cent Attendance

Grade	1964-65 Period 2	Period 6	Difference 2 - 6	1965-66 Period 2	Period 6	Difference 2 - 6
2	91.7	86.9	-4.8	89.1	89.6	+.5
3	94.6	88.3	-6.3	90.3	88.8	-1.5
4	93.7	94.9	+1.2	90.9	90.1	-.8
5	93.5	88.7	-4.8	90.5	90.3	-.2
6	94.2	89.9	-4.3	91.0	89.6	-1.4

The rate of pupil attendance during the latter part of 1964-65 is smaller than the percentage attending school at the beginning of the year before the transitional school program went into effect. The average difference in percentage of pupil attendance form period 2 to 6 was 4.8%, 6-3%, 4.8% and 4.3% for grades 2,3,4 and 6 respectively. In grade 4 attendance rates were higher in period 6 than in period 2.

During 1965-66, the program year, the percentage of pupils attending school is generally lower than the percentage attending the previous year, but there is less of a decrease between beginning and end year rates.

Both ESEA and non-ESEA personnel in the sample elementary schools were queired about changes in school attendance as a result of the program. (See item 9, Rating Scale for Teachers.) Both groups noted a minor improvement in attendance, from the beginning to the end of the year; compared with the previous year, there was a marked improvement in attendance rates reflected in the smaller difference between periods 2 and 6, although the absolute rate of attendance did not improve.

Junior High Schools

Table 22 summarizes the percentage of pupils in grades 7, 8 and 9 attending school in periods 2 and 6, 1964-65 and 1965-66.

Table 22

The Average Percentage of Junior High School Pupils Attending School During 1964-65 and 1965-66 in the Sample Schools.

Average Per Cent Attendance

	1964-65			1965-66		
Grade	Period 2	Period 6	Difference Pd.2 -Pd.6	Period 2	Period 6	Difference Pd.2 - Pd.6
7	91.7	87.3	-4.4	86.7	91.2	+4.5
8	89.8	86.8	-3.0	84.4	84.5	+ .1
9	89.8	86.5	-3.3	83.9	83.0	- .6

During 1964-65, the percentages of pupils attending school was smaller at the end of the school year than at the beginning. During 1965-66, although the absolute rates were lower, there was less of a decrease in per cent attendance from period 2 to period 6. For grades 7 and 8 attendance rates in period 6 improved. It is interesting to note that the ESEA and non-ESEA personnel in the sample junior high schools rated attendance as decreasing during the school year; it is possible that they were comparing attendance during 1965-66 with attendance during 1964-65, rather than "remembering pupils at the beginning of the school year."

Summary and Conclusions

In order to "stem the tide of emigration of white middle class families from borderline neighborhoods," a "Special Enrichment Program Geared to Excellence for Schools in Transitional Areas" was proposed by the New York City Board of Education. Under the provisions of Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, 79 elementary schools and 37 junior high schools in the city received support for additional professional and administrative school positions for 1965-66. These personnel were to provide enriched educational experiences.

The goals of the program were "to increase: (1) proficiency in reading and arithmetic by providing special remedial teachers, (2) general achievement by providing tutorial services, (3) interest and motivation for school by providing a variety of special classes and clubs both during and after school,(4) the general adjustment and mental hygiene by providing increased guidance services, (5) motivation and appreciation for reading by

offering improved library facilities, and (6) community pride in the schools by providing for active participation by parents in the school program." These objectives would be realized by saturating the schools with specialists and with additional classroom teachers who would reduce the size of classes.

A total of 116 schools, described as integrated schools in areas having a high concentration of low income families, were selected to participate in the program; 37 schools were in Brooklyn, 30 in Queens, 29 schools were selected in the Bronx, 19 were Manhattan schools and one school from Richmond participated. The ethnic composition of the elementary schools at the start of the 1965-66 school year was 37.8 per cent Negro, 21.4 per cent Puerto Rican and 40.8 per cent other. At the junior high school level the school population was composed of 27.6 per cent Negroes, 21.9 per cent Puerto Ricans and 50.5 per cent others as of October 31, 1965.

Prior to the start of the school year, the Board of Education notified the principals of the selected schools that an additional number of positions were available to their schools. A total of 439 positions were assigned to 78 of the 79 elementary schools. Authorization to fill the positions was received for 421.4, or 96.6 per cent of the positions.

The elementary schools were assigned classroom teachers to reduce class size, corrective reading teachers, school secretaries, music teachers, health education teachers, science specialists, guidance counselors,art teachers, teachers for citizenship classes, remedial instruction, library and other types of specialists.

The 37 junior high schools were assigned a total of 280 positions including library teachers, additional teachers to reduce class size and provide regular teachers with preparation periods, career guidance teachers, laboratory assistants, guidance counselors corrective reading teachers and school secretaries.

Data on the number and kinds of positions received and filled were obtained from questionnaires to the principals of the the 79 elementary and 37 junior high schools. In addition, principals were asked to describe the programs developed and the gains made

as a result of the assignment of these personnel, ESEA personnel in the sample schools (and a control group of non-ESEA in the same sample schools) were asked to rate changes in pupil behavior, attitude and achievement. Reading and arithmetic achievement test results were collected for the sample of 25 randomly selected elementary and ten junior high schools. Changes in attendance rates and class size for 1964-65 and 1965-66 were obtained. The major findings are summarized below for elementary and junior high schools separately.

Elementary Schools

1. Based on the results of returns to the principals' questionnaires, 439 additional positions were assigned to the elementary schools.

Schools differed in the number of additional ESEA positions assigned. One school was assigned 13 additional staff positions for the year 1965-66. On the average, each of the 78 elementary schools was assigned an additional 5.63 positions.

2. Approximately 90 per cent of the positions assigned were filled.

a. The positions filled most of ten included Assistant-to-Principal, Non-English Coordinator, Auxiliary Teacher, School secretary and teachers for remedial instruction.

b. Schools were less likely to fill openings for guidance counselors, teachers of science, health education and citizenship classes.

c. On the basis of the sample schools it was found that 31 per cent of the positions were not filled until January 1966.

3. Although the elementary school principals were generally enthusiastic about the ESEA positions, many of them were concerned with the shortage of experienced classroom teachers; as a result of the shortage of staff, many of the specialists were drafted into the classroom.

Although, on the average, each school received about one additional classroom teacher specifically assigned to reduce class size, there was little change in average class size in the elementary schools. At the beginning of 1964-65 the class size for grades 2-6 averaged 30.3 pupils; at the beginning of the program year the class size for grades 2-6 in the sample schools averaged 30.1 pupils.

4. Seventy elementary school principals indicated adaptations of programs, activities and curriculum as a result of the additional positions.

a. The ESEA personnel were generally used to expand programs already in operation in the schools, the music programs in particular were frequently developed as a result of the additional personnel. Remedial reading programs, art, science and health education programs were also frequently mentioned by the Principals as having been enriched as a result of the assignment of ESEA personnel.

b. There was general agreement among principals that the over-all school program was improved; special note was made of dramatic improvement in reading.

c. Most principals indicated that guidance and guidance-related activities improved; there was an increase in the identification of emotionally maladjusted pupils and pupils with reading disturbances. Principals attributed this largely to the reduction of class size.

5. There was a positive change in pupil attitude and behavior as a result of the assignment of additional personnel.

a. Sixty-nine principals of the elementary schools indicated improvement in pupil behavior and attitude. They noted increased pupil interest in reading, music, art, science and health education.

b. All school personnel noted an improvement in pupils from the beginning of the year to the end of the year; the ESEA personnel in particular rated pupils improved in scholastic attitudes, social attitudes, work and study habits, adjustment and achievement at the end of the program year. The areas of greatest improvement were attitudes, scholastic and social. Least improvement was noted in pupils' work and study habits.

6. School personnel noted least change in school attendance, although they indicated some small improvement.

a. There was a decrease in average per cent attendance from the beginning of 1964-65 1965-66 for each grade 2-6 in the sample schools.

b. During 1964-65, the year prior to the program, average per cent attendance

decreased from the beginning to the end of the year. During the program year, there was a smaller but similar decrease from the beginning of the year to the end of the year.

7. Fifty-nine elementary school principals were of the opinion that the academic performance of pupils improved as a result of the assignment of additional personnel. The area of greatest improvement, according to the principals, was reading. One principal anticipated growth in reading of 2.5 years. Improvement in the musical performance of pupils was mentioned by two principals. There was no indication of improved performance in arithmetic. In general the sample of ESEA and non-ESEA personnel rated pupils' test performance as having been improved.

a. There was no improvement in reading as measured by standardized reading achievement tests. Based on the results of a standardized reading achievement test, pupils in the second grade in the sample schools averaged two school months below grade placement level at the beginning of the program year and three months retarded by May of the school year. Third graders were retarded three school months and pupils in grades 4, 5 and 6 were, on the average, six two and four months below grade placement at the beginning of the year. By the end of the year grades 3-6 were one, four, three and three months retarded in reading respectively. Compared with the previous year there was a decrease in rate of retardation for grade 6.

b. During the program year, achievement in arithmetic was poorer than during the year before the program year. During 1965-66 fourth and sixth grade pupils were tested in arithmetic achievement. At the time of the testing, fourth grade pupils scored on the average, eight school months below grade placement; during the previous year, 1964-65, the fourth grade in the same sample schools were only five school months retarded in arithmetic. Sixth graders in the program were one school year below grade placement level at the time of the achievement test. Druing the year prior to the program the sixth grade was only four school months retarded. These differences are significant. But bear in mind the change in school population, so that more disadvantaged children were in later group.

8. The elementary school principals tended to agree that teacher morale improved as a result of the program. Three principals indicated negative changes in morale.

9. Seventy-two principals indicated a positive but vague improvement in the attitude of parents toward the school.

Junior High School

1. All 37 junior principals responded to the questionnaire. A total of 280 ESEA positions were assigned. Each school was assigned an average of 7.57 additional positions.

2. Approximately 83 per cent of the positions assigned were filled.

a. Junior high schools most often filled the openings for school secretaries, laboratory assistants, and corrective reading teachers.

b. The positions of library teachers, career guidance teachers and extra teachers to form new classes were least likely to be filled.

3. The principals of the junior high schools were not as enthusiastic about the program as were the principals of the elementary schools. The principals were concerned with the basis on which the assignment were made, suggesting they were in the best position to decide which personnel were needed and how they were to be used.

4. Thirty-two of the principals felt that, as a result of the assignment of the ESEA personnel, there were program and activities initiated and expanded.

a. As was the case at the elementary level, the ESEA personnel were used most often to augment and expand programs already in existence in the schools. Remedial reading programs, library and book programs and guidance and orientation programs benefited most.

b. The majority of principals agreed that current programs were enriched, especially science and library and reading programs. The improvement of the general school program was attributed to smaller classes, more teacher preparation time and a better guidance program.

c. While the principals concurred in the improved identification of problem children, most responses were vague and general. A few mentioned the better identification of speech and reading retardates.

5. About two-thirds of the principals felt there was a change in pupil attitude and behavior.

a. Increased interest in remedial instruction and improved general behavior was most often noted by the principals.

b. The ESEA and non-ESEA teachers sampled, generally indicated an improvement in pupils' scholastic attitudes. For both groups of personnel the change from beginning year to end year behavior of students tended to be small; positive changes were noted in adherence to instructions, dependability and class work. The ESEA personnel rated pupils as not improving in respect for school rules and property; there was a negative change, pupils' behavior worsened, in the areas of personal appearance, attendance, peer relations and test performance. The non-ESEA personnel indicated negative change only in school attendance.

6. Although average per cent attendance in grades 7, 8 and 9 was lower at the beginning of 1965-66 than during the previous year, there was an improvement in the average percentage of pupils attending school by the end of the school year 1965-66 as compared with the beginning of the year. In general, however, the absolute rates were high in 1964-65, although the beginning-end year difference was smaller during the program.

7. Twenty-five principals indicated a change in academic performance as a result of the additional personnel, although half of them felt it was too soon to comment. When specific improvement was indicated it was more likely to be in the area of reading.

When the pupils in grades 7, 8 and 9 of the sample schools were tested in reading at the beginning of the year, they averaged nine months below their grade placement level respectively. Toward the end of the program year, seventh, eighth and ninth graders were respectively, about one year, one year three months and one year two months retarded in reading. No improvement in reading achievement for groups of pupils may be attributed to the transitional school program.

8. Average class size was reduced in grades 7, 8 and 9 in the sample junior high schools during the program year. The decrease between 1964-65 to 1965-66 from 29.5 to 29.1 in grade

7, from 29.8 to 28.8 in grade 8 and from 28.4 to 27.4 in grade 9 may be largely attributed to a decrease in register; the total number of classes in the ten junior high schools increased from 520 in 1964-65 to 522 in 1965-66.

9. The majority of principals agreed that teacher morale improved as a result of the extra services and reduced class size. Only two principals felt that morale suffered.

10. Most of the principals felt that there was not enough available information to determine specifically the affect of the program on parental attitude toward the school, although they did indicate a positive change due to the assignemnt of the additional ESEA personnel.

Although the more positive aspects of the program as noted by the teachers and principals of the school--e.g., improved performance in reading, development of music program, smaller classes and more teacher preparation time--were not supported by the data, it does not necessarily follow that the transitional program was not effective. The data are interim in nature; for example, without the school-by-school results of the October 31, 1966 ethnic census data, the effects of the program on the primary goal, stemming the white middle class exodus, cannot be estimated.

In addition the instruments that were developed and the data which were collected did not sample other of the program's objectives; there was no concern with, for example, tutorial services, special classes and clubs both during and after the regular school day.

Most of the data were collected for the smaller group of sample schools. Although these schools were selected at random, there were small differences between the sample schools and the total group of schools. For example, the ethnic composition differed somewhat as did the number and kinds of positions assigned and filled. In addition, the junior high school sample was composed of an abundance of special service schools.

The most serious defect in the test data is with the group comparisons; without an adequate control group, comparisons between individuals would provide more accurate information about growth and change. In comparing achievement in reading for example, between October and May, it is important that the groups be composed of the same individuals.

Lacking this information, an equivalent group of control pupils not in the program is necessary.

However, any statement of the program's effectiveness must account for the enthusiasm of the principals of the participating schools, and any similar program in the future should take into account their suggestions including complete and full explanations of the program, early and definitive notification of the personnel to be assigned, some choice in the kinds of positions to be assigned and some hlep in filling those positions.

A P P E N D I X A

Program No. 22- ____ May 17, 1966

BOARD OF EDUCATION OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK
BUREAU OF EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH

PRINCIPALS' QUESTIONNAIRE

Principal, PS____

Dear

Under the provisions of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, Title I, your school was granted the following additional staff during the current school year, in order to help enrich the educational program at your school:

Additional Staff	Number
School Secretary	
Assistant to Principal	
Guidance Counselor	
N.E. Coordinator	
Citizen. Class	
Library	
Auxiliary Teacher	
Reduce Class Size	
Corrective Reading	
Health Education	
Art	
Music	
Science	
Remedial Instruction	
Laboratory Assistant	
Career Guidance	
Preparation Period	
Total ESEA Positions	

As the 1965-1966 school year is drawing to a close, it is necessary for the Board of Education, through the Bureau of Educational Research, to report to the Federal Government on the manner in which federal funds were spent and the degree to which education has been enriched during the school year as a result of additional staff positions supported by them. Therefore, I enlist your cooperation in answering the questions listed on the next page and in returning your responses by May 25, 1966.

Please return all questionnaires to the Bureau of Educational Research, Room _____, 110 Livingston Street, Brooklyn, N.Y. 11201.

Respectfully,

J. Wayne Wrightstone
Assistant Superintendent

BOARD OF EDUCATION OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK
BUREAU OF EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH

PRINCIPAL QUESTIONNAIRE

May, 1966

1. Did you receive all of the additional positions listed on the accompanying page? Yes ___ No ___

2. If "No", which did you not receive?

_____ _____ _____

_____ _____ _____

3. If you were not able to fill all the additional positions received, indicate those that you were not able to fill.

_____ _____ _____

_____ _____ _____

4. For each position listed on page I which you actually received as an official position allowance and were able to fill, describe the major activities performed by the incumbent. For each position indicate the grade(s) receiving the services.

5. Were there any programs, activities or curriculum adaptations instituted in your school that have been made possible as a direct result of one or more of the additional positions listed on the accompanying page?

Yes ____ No ____

6. If "Yes," please describe the programs or activities (if more room is needed, attach additional sheets.)

_____

_____

_____

7. Has there been any enrichment of current programs or activities as a result of the additional positions? Yes_____ No_____

Please comment_____

_____

_____

8. Is it possible for you to report any academic improvement as a result of the additional positions? Yes_____ No_____

Please comment_____

_____

_____

9. Have there been any changes in pupil attitude or behavior as a result of the additional positions? Yes_____ No_____

Please comment_____

_____

_____

10. Has there been an increase in the identification of pupils having problems as a result of the additional positions? Yes_____ No_____

Please comment_____

_____

_____

11. Have there been any changes in teacher morale as a result of these positions? Yes_____ No _____

Please comment_____

_____

_____

12. Have there been any changes in parental attitude as a result of these positions?

Yes_____ No_____

Please comment_____

_____

_____

13. Please write in any additional comments you wish to make on any of the above items.

A P P E N D I X B

E S E A
P.N. 22-248

NEW YORK CITY BOARD OF EDUCATION
BUREAU OF EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH

June 1, 1966

Dear

Recently, you completed a questionnaire in connection with certain ESEA positions that you received during this current school year.

As a further part of our evaluation, I am now sending you Scales for Teacher Ratings of Pupils. These questionnaires are to be distributed to:

1. The professional personnel listed at the bottom of this letter who are being paid by ESEA funds, and

2. Two teachers on each grade who are not paid by ESEA funds. These teachers are to be selected by you at random.

Unused questionnaires should be destroyed. Please ask the teachers concerned to return their questionnaires to you promptly in order that you may return all of them to this office by June 10, 1966.

Return envelopes have been provided for convenience. If you have any questions, please call Dr. Herbert Hoffman at 596-6145.

Thank you for your cooperation in this matter.

Sincerely yours,

J. WAYNE WRIGHTSTONE
Assistant Superintendent

ESEA Personnel who are to receive questionnaires

E S E A
Program No. 22-458

BOARD OF EDUCATION OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK
BUREAU OF EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH

Scale for Teacher Rating of Pupils

PLEASE FILL IN THE INFORMATION REQUESTED BELOW
(All data are confidential and will be used only for research purposes.)

School_____ Borough_____ District_____

Grade levels presently taught or primarily associated with:

Kngtn._____ Grade 1_____ Grade 2_____ Grade 3_____ Grade 4_____

Grade 5_____ Grade 6_____ Grade 7_____ Grade 8_____ Grade 9_____

When did you first begin working at your school? Month_____ Year_____

Professional specialty (e.g., guidance, math, common branches):_____

The purpose of this scale is to evaluate pupils on the basis of the specific items categorized under general headings on the next page. Pupils should be rated on a group basis as they are remembered at the beginning of the year (i.e., Fall, 1965) and as they are presently thought of. In indicating evaluations, rating numbers are to be circled. The following rating scale should be applied:

1. = superior

2. = above average

3. = average

4. = below average

5. = poor

ESEA
P.N. 22-458

ITEMS

Beginning of Year Rating Scale						Scholastic Attitudes	End of Year (Now) Rating Scale				
1	2	3	4	5	1.	Positiveness of attitudes toward school and school work (e.g., attentiveness).	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	2.	Interest in voluntary, supplementary school activities (e.g., special committees and projects).	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	3.	Motivation for self-improvement.	1	2	3	4	5
						Social Attitudes					
1	2	3	4	5	4.	Respect for the rights of others	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	5.	Positiveness of attitudes evidenced toward teachers (e.g., respect).	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	6.	Respect for school rules and property.	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	7.	Personal appearance and grooming.	1	2	3	4	5
						Work and Study Habits					
1	2	3	4	5	8.	Dependability regarding class, test, and home preparation.	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	9.	Quality of school attendance.	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	10.	Adherence to teacher instructions.	1	2	3	4	5
						Adjustment					
1	2	3	4	5	11.	Quality of peer relations.	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	12.	Quality of classroom behavior.	1	2	3	4	5
						Achievement					
1	2	3	4	5	13.	Quality of standardized and class test performance.	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	14.	Quality of general classwork and scholastic performance.	1	2	3	4	5

NOTE: Please make sure that you have rated pupils on each item.

APPENDIX C

Manhattan Schools:
Elementary: 1, 4, 31, 34, 84, 87, 97, 111, 116, 128, 130, 166, 177, 132, 173, 189
Junior High Schools: 60, 71, 167

Bronx Schools:
Elementary: 36, 60, 67, 11, 21, 33, 41, 71, 73, 76, 77, 78, 88, 93, 100, 103, 104, 111, 121
Junior High Schools: 44, 45, 79, 80, 113, 115, 117, 123, 142, 143

Brooklyn Schools:
Elementary: 17, 19, 73, 110, 113, 158, 159, 77, 91, 92, 108, 116, 123. 161, 167, 181, 190, 202, 221, 241
Junior High School: 10, 50, 51, 64, 126, 136, 142, 149, 162, 166, 296, 61, 211, 232, 239, 252, 285

Queens Schools:
Elementary: 15, 19, 30, 31, 42, 45, 52, 80, 83, 105, 118, 121, 124, 132, 134, 136, 143, 147, 150, 156, 176, 197, 215
Junior High School: 204, 67, 125, 141, 145, 192, 198

Richmond Schools:
Elementary: 20